

CENTER FOR PRIORITY BASED BUDGETING

“Using a Unique Lens to Focus Community Resources on Results”

City of Bainbridge Island, Washington Guidance and Considerations For Scoring Governance Programs

One of the most critical steps in implementing the **Prioritization Process** is the *Scoring of Programs*. In this step, each department that offers services internally is responsible for reviewing all programs and services identified in their program inventories and then scoring each individual program relative to the City’s SIX “**Governance**” Results. Those **Governance** Results for the The City of Bainbridge Island are:

- ***Attracts, Motivates, Develops and Retains a High-Quality, Engaged, Productive Workforce***
- ***Develops Sustainable Fiscal and Operational Policies and Fosters Trust and Transparency by Ensuring Accountability, Efficiency, Integrity, Innovation and Best Practices in all Operations***
- ***Protects, Manages, Optimizes and Invests in its Financial, Human, Physical and Technology Resources***
- ***Provides Assurance of Regulatory Policy Compliance to Minimize and Mitigate Risk***
- ***Provides Responsive and Accessible Leadership and Facilitates Timely and Effective Two-Way Communication and Input with All Stakeholders***
- ***Supports Decision-Making with Timely and Accurate Short-Term and Long Range Analysis that Enhances Vision and Planning***

The objective of the program scoring process is to gain a better understanding of two main concepts:

- The first concept in the program scoring process is gaining a clear understanding of how each of the programs offered impacts the individual **Governance** Results that the City’s departments providing internally focused services exist to achieve. The scoring process helps identify how each of the individual programs and services offered by the City influences or impacts the ability to achieve any or all of the SIX stated Governance-related Results identified on the scorecard. There are some programs that may not have any type of influence in trying to achieve these Results. There will also be those programs that may assist the City in achieving only one of the stated Results. Finally, there may also be programs and services that are able to influence the achievement of several or even all of the City’s **Governance** Results. As each department evaluates their individual programs, they must first determine if there is any connection between that program and its ability to achieve any or all of the City’s identified Governance-related Results. There is no limitation in this process as to the number of Results that a program might influence – if there is a connection between the program and its ability to achieve several or all of the Results, then the department is allowed to evaluate that program against as many of the Results as possible where this association can be clearly justified and explained.
- Once the first concept is understood and a connection between the program and one or more of the City’s stated **Governance** Results has been made, then the second concept in the program scoring process must be considered – what degree of impact does the individual program have on the associated Result(s) for which the connection has been identified. Programs may certainly impact the achievement of a particular Result, but understanding the degree of that influence - whether minor in nature or conversely very significant in nature – is a crucial role of the department in completing their individual Program Prioritization Scorecard.

Departments will receive a program scorecard (an *example of which is included in these instructions*) which lists only the programs and services offered as shown on their individual program inventory listing. The department is then responsible for scoring each program using a “0-4” rating system against the City’s **Governance** Results and also against the FIVE Basic Attributes that have been defined to also assist the City in differentiating one program against another.

In scoring the programs against the **Governance** Results, the department applies the two concepts outlined previously – how does the program influence the City’s ability to achieve each of the Results and, if it is determined the program does influence the achievement of that Result, to what **degree** does it impact the successful accomplishment of the Result. Using a “0-4” scale, with “0” meaning that there is no degree of impact since there is no influence on the Result and “4” meaning that the department strongly believes it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, for the City to achieve the overall Result if this program were not offered, the department assigns a score for each program associated with each of the stated **Governance** Results. The degree of impact for programs lessens as a score of “3”, “2” or “1” is assigned, meaning that a program scored with a smaller number still is seen as influencing the achievement of a particular Result but to a lesser degree – i.e. a score of “1” communicates that while the program influences a particular Result, the City could still most likely achieve that overall Result even if the program did not exist. For every program and service offered by the City, the program scoring process helps clarify the relative influence that programs have on the Results that the City exists to achieve – it will help to more clearly understand programs that are highly influential relative to Results, as well as programs that have a lesser degree of influence.

The grading criterion established to score programs in order to determine their degrees of impact are as follows - on a scale of **0 to 4** points:

- **4** = program has an essential or critical role in achieving the Result (*i.e. the The City of Bainbridge Island most likely could not achieve this overall Result without the existence of this program*)
- **3** = program has a strong influence on achieving the Result
- **2** = program has some degree of influence on achieving the Result
- **1** = program has some influence, though minimal, on achieving the Result
- **0** = program has no influence on achieving the Result

The kinds of questions that a department should ask as they consider scoring their programs include:

- What impact does the program have on residents, Elected Officials, City Administration and/or City staff, relative to the Governance Result under consideration?
 - If the program has a high degree of influence on the ability for these groups to govern, manage and support the City organization, specific to the Result under consideration, then the program might deserve a score of “3” or “4”.
 - If the program impacts the ability to govern, manage or support the City organization only to a minor extent, specific to the Result under consideration, but there’s certainly an impact, then the program might deserve a score of “1” or “2”.
- If the program were no longer provided, would the impact on the ability to achieve the Governance Result under consideration be highly significant or less significant?
 - If the absence of the program would greatly compromise the City’s ability to meet the Result under consideration, then the program might deserve a score of “3” or “4”.
 - If the absence of the program would not have much of an impact on the City’s ability to achieve the Result under consideration, but some impact would be felt, then the program might deserve a score of “1” or “2”.

Programs are also evaluated relative to **Basic Program Attributes**, which are additional characteristics of programs that could increase their overall relevance. Those attributes selected by the The City of Bainbridge Island to assist in the Program Prioritization Scoring process are:

- **Mandated to Provide Program** — Programs that are mandated by another level of government (*i.e. federal, state or county*) will receive a higher score for this attribute compared to programs that are mandated solely by the City or have no mandate whatsoever. The grading criterion established to score programs, on a **0 to 4** scale is as follows:
 - **4** = Program is required in writing by Federal, State or County legislation.
 - **3** = Program is required by Charter or other incorporation documents **OR** is required in order to comply with regulatory agency standards
 - **2** = Program is required by a Code, ordinance, resolution or policy **OR** is required to fulfill an executed franchise or contractual agreement.
 - **1** = Program is recommended by a national professional organization to meet published standards or as a best practice.
 - **0** = No requirement or mandate exists.

- **Reliance on City to Provide Program** — Programs for which residents, businesses and visitors can look only to the City to obtain the service will receive a higher score for this attribute compared to programs that may be similarly obtained from another intergovernmental agency or a private business. The grading criterion established to score programs, on a **0 to 4** scale is as follows:
 - **4** = City is the sole provider of the program and there are **no** other public or private entities that provide a similar service
 - **3** = City is currently the sole provider of the program but there are other public or private entities that could be contracted to provide a similar service
 - **2** = Program is only offered by another governmental, non-profit or civic agency
 - **1** = Program is offered by other private businesses but none are located within the City limits
 - **0** = Program is offered by other private businesses located within the City limits

- **Change in Demand for Program** — Programs demonstrating an increase in demand or utilization will receive a higher score for this attribute compared to programs that show no growth in demand or utilization for the program or service. Programs demonstrating a decrease in demand or utilization will actually receive a negative score for this attribute. The grading criterion established to score programs, on a **-4 to 4** scale is as follows:
 - **4** = Program experiencing a **SUBSTANTIAL** increase in demand of 25% or more
 - **3** = Program experiencing a **SIGNIFICANT** increase in demand of 15% to 24%
 - **2** = Program experiencing a **MODEST** increase in demand of 5% to 14%
 - **1** = Program experiencing a **MINIMAL** increase in demand of 1% to 4%
 - **0** = Program experiencing **NO** change in demand
 - **-1** = Program experiencing a **MINIMAL** decrease in demand of 1% to 4%
 - **-2** = Program experiencing **MODEST** decrease in demand of 5% to 14%
 - **-3** = Program experiencing a **SIGNIFICANT** decrease in demand of 15% to 24%
 - **-4** = Program experiencing a **SUBSTANTIAL** decrease in demand of 25% or more

- **Portion of Organization Served by Program** — Programs that benefit or serve a larger segment of the City's internal departments will receive a higher score for this attribute compared to programs that benefit or serve only a small segment of the organization. The grading criterion established to score programs, on a 0 to 4 scale is as follows:
 - **4** = Program benefits/serves the **ENTIRE** organization (100%)
 - **3** = Program benefits/serves a **SUBSTANTIAL** portion of the organization (at least 75%)
 - **2** = Program benefits/serves a **SIGNIFICANT** portion of the organization (at least 50%)
 - **1** = Program benefits/serves **SOME** portion of the organization (at least 10%)
 - **0** = Program benefits/serves only a **SMALL** portion of the organization (less than 10%)

